



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

30
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,738	01/10/2001	Larry Moriarty	10420-1080	9025

7590 04/22/2002

George M. Thomas, Esq.
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.
Atlanta, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER

PARSLEY, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3643

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/758,738	MORIARTY, LARRY
	Examiner David J Parsley	Art Unit 3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

PETER M. POON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

PMP

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office address is required.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 11 line 2 the reference numeral “124” should be --122--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 125, 222, 225, and 226. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim states "...said tubular support and said rod defining aligned openings..." It is not known where the aligned openings are with respect to the tubular support and rod. Therefore the claim is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,037,351 to Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,738 to Hazenbroek et al.

Referring to claim 1, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. discloses a shackle for transporting a poultry carcass suspended by its legs along a processing path and over a weighing scale track for weighing the carcass, the shackle assembly comprising a trolley

support – 6 and 25, a trolley – 8 and 12 mounted to the trolley support – 6 and 25 for engaging the weighing scale track – 10, a bird carrier – 4 for suspending the poultry carcass – 32 from the trolley support – 6,15 and 25, and a turning means – 21 and 29 mounted to the trolley support – 6,15, and 25 and operatively connected to the bird carrier – 4 for rotating the trolley support – 15 and the bird carrier – 4 in unison – see figures 1-8 and column 5 lines 13-54. Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. does not disclose a telescopic connector means for telescopically connecting the trolley support to the bird carrier and suspending the bird carrier from the trolley support. Hazenbroek et al. does disclose a telescopic connector means – 14 and 48 for telescopically connecting the trolley support – 20 to the bird carrier – 12 and suspending the bird carrier – 12 from the trolley support – 20 – see figures 1-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and add the telescopic connector means of Hazenbroek et al., so as to make the device more compact and efficient in that the poultry carcass can be raised and lowered as desired to accommodate various processing functions thus allowing the same trolley track to be used for more than one processing application, thus reducing the components needed for the device and making the operation quicker.

Referring to claim 2, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. does not disclose wherein the telescopic connector means includes one of the trolley support and the bird carrier having a tubular support rod defining a central passage and the other of the trolley support and the bird carrier having a rod extending into the central passage. Hazenbroek et al. does disclose the telescopic connector means – 14 and 48 includes one of the trolley support – 16 and 20 and the bird carrier – 12 having a tubular support rod – 48 defining a central

passage and the other of the trolley support – 16 and 20 and the bird carrier – 12 having a rod – 14 extending into the central passage – see figures 1-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and add the telescopic connector means including a tubular support rod and a rod of Hazenbroek et al., so as to make the device more compact and efficient in that the poultry carcass can be raised and lowered as desired to accommodate various processing functions thus allowing the same trolley track to be used for more than one processing application, thus reducing the components needed for the device and making the operation quicker.

Referring to claim 7, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. discloses a shackle for transporting a poultry carcass suspended by its legs along a processing path and over a weighing scale track for weighing the carcass, the shackle assembly comprising a trolley support – 6 and 25, a trolley – 8 and 12 mounted to the trolley support – 6 and 25 for engaging the weighing scale – 16, a bird carrier – 4 for suspending the poultry carcass – 32 from the trolley support – 6,15 and 25, and a turning means – 21 and 29 mounted to the trolley support – 6,15, and 25 and operatively connected to the bird carrier – 4 for rotating the trolley support – 15 for turning the bird carrier – 4 in response to engagement by a cam – 28 along the processing path – 10 – see figures 1-8 and column 5 lines 13-54. Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. does not disclose a connector means for non-rotatably and telescopically connecting the bird carrier to the trolley support. Hazenbroek et al. does disclose a connector means – 14 and 48 for non-rotatably and telescopically connecting the bird carrier 12 to the trolley support - 20 – see figures 1-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den

Nieuwelaar et al. and add the telescopic connector means of Hazenbroek et al., so as to make the device more compact and efficient in that the poultry carcass can be raised and lowered as desired to accommodate various processing functions thus allowing the same trolley track to be used for more than one processing application, thus reducing the components needed for the device and making the operation quicker.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,456,224 to Sullivan.

Referring to claim 3, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose the telescopic connector means includes the trolley support having a tubular support rod defining a central passage and the bird carrier having a rod extending into the central passage of the tubular support. Sullivan does disclose the telescopic connector means – 19, 20 and 27 includes the trolley support – 12 having a tubular support rod – 19 defining a central passage and the bird carrier – 31 having a rod – 20 and 27 extending into the central passage of the tubular support – 19 – see figures 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. and add the trolley support having the tubular support rod and the bird carrier having the rod of Sullivan, so as to make the device more compact and efficient in that the poultry carcass can be raised and lowered as desired to accommodate various processing functions thus allowing the same trolley track to be used for more than one processing application, thus reducing the components needed for the device and making the operation quicker.

Referring to claim 4, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose the telescopic connector means further including the tubular support and the rod defining aligned openings and wherein the trolley includes a wheel axle extending through the aligned openings for engaging the tubular support and the rod, at least one of the aligned openings also being of larger breadth than a cross-sectional breadth of the wheel axle for permitting telescopic movement between the tubular support and the rod in a substantially non-rotating relationship. Sullivan does disclose the telescopic connector means – 19, 20 and 27 further including the tubular support – 19 and the rod – 20 and 27 defining aligned openings – 23 and wherein the trolley includes a wheel axle – 21 extending through the aligned openings – 23 for engaging the tubular support – 19 and the rod – 20 and 27, at least one of the aligned openings – 23 also being of larger breadth than a cross-sectional breadth of the wheel axle for permitting telescopic movement between the tubular support – 19 and the rod – 20 and 27 in a substantially non-rotating relationship – see figures 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. and add the tubular support and rod with aligned openings of Sullivan, so as to make the device as compact and lightweight as possible since the tubular support, rod and wheel axle are all connected through the same openings.

Referring to claim 5, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose the larger breadth opening is arranged in the tubular support rod. Sullivan does disclose the larger breadth opening – 23 is arranged in the tubular support rod – 19 – see figures 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. and further

add the larger breadth opening in the tubular support of Sullivan, so as to make the device easier to manufacture in that the wheel axle can easily fit into the tubular support since the opening is much larger than the axle and less work to assemble the device is required since the fit between the wheel axle and the tubular support is not tight.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. in view of Sullivan as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. further discloses the turning means – 21 and 29 includes a pin – 21 for indicating an angular position of the turning means – 21 and 29 – see figures 1-8 and column 5 lines 13-54. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and Sullivan and further add the turning means with a pin to indicate the angular position of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., so as to make the device easy to operate since the position of the pin shows which position the turning means is in, therefore indicating to the user which position the device is to be in.

Claims 8-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,781,946 to Altenpohl.

Referring to claim 8, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose the connector means comprises the trolley support and the bird carrier having overlapping ends with aligned openings extending therethrough and the trolley having a wheel axle extending through the aligned openings. Altenpohl does disclose the connector means – 28 and 36 comprises the trolley support – 38 and 40 and the bird

carrier – 28, 14, and 12 having overlapping ends with aligned openings extending therethrough and the trolley – 20 having a wheel axle - 26 extending through the aligned openings – see figures 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. and add the trolley support and bird carrier having overlapping ends with aligned openings so as to make the device as compact and lightweight as possible since the components are connected directly to each other.

Referring to claim 9, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose the overlapping ends are adapted to move axially with respect to each other in response to the trolley passing over the weighing scale. Altenpohl does disclose the overlapping ends are adapted to move axially with respect to each other in response to the trolley – 20 passing over the weighing scale – see figures 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. and further add the overlapping ends adapted to move axially with respect to each other of Altenpohl, so as to make the device more flexible in that the bird carrier and trolley support can move in different directions relative to one another thus giving the device more possible positions of the poultry carcass as it is being processed.

Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. in view of Altenpohl as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hazenbroek et al.

Referring to claim 10, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Altenpohl do not disclose wherein the telescopic connector means includes one of the trolley support and the bird

carrier having a tubular support rod defining a central passage and the other of the trolley support and the bird carrier having a rod extending into the central passage. Hazenbroek et al. does disclose the telescopic connector means – 14 and 48 includes one of the trolley support – 16 and 20 and the bird carrier – 12 having a tubular support rod – 48 defining a central passage and the other of the trolley support – 16 and 20 and the bird carrier – 12 having a rod – 14 extending into the central passage – see figures 1-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al. and Altenpohl and further add the telescopic connector means including a tubular support rod and a rod of Hazenbroek et al., so as to make the device more compact and efficient in that the poultry carcass can be raised and lowered as desired to accommodate various processing functions thus allowing the same trolley track to be used for more than one processing application, thus reducing the components needed for the device and making the operation quicker.

Referring to claim 11, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Altenpohl do not disclose a top end of the rod is fixed to the trolley support and a top end of the tubular support slidably receives the rod. Hazenbroek et al. does disclose a top end of the rod – 14 is fixed to the trolley support – 20 and a top end of the tubular support – 48 slidably receives the rod – 14 – see figures 1-5. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and Altenpohl and further add the rod fixed to the trolley support and the tubular support slidably receiving the rod of Hazenbroek et al., so as to make the device stronger and more flexible in that the rod fixed to the trolley support makes that connection stronger and the tubular support slidably receiving the rod allows the rod to

move in to different configurations with respect to the tubular support thus making the device more flexible.

Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. in view of Altenpohl as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Altenpohl.

Referring to claim 13, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose a top end of the tubular support is fixed to the trolley support and a bottom end of the tubular support slidably receives the rod. Altenpohl does disclose a top end of the tubular support – 40 is fixed to the trolley support – 36 and a bottom end of the tubular support – 40 slidably receives the rod – 14 and 28 – see figures 1-3 which shows the bottom portion – 40 of support – 36 as being tubular and see figure 2 which shows a gap between the walls of – 40 and the upper section – 32 of the shaft – 14 and 28, therefore the shaft can slide about shaft 26. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and Altenpohl and further add the tubular support fixed to the trolley support and the bottom end of the tubular support receiving the rod, so as to make the device stronger and more flexible in that the tubular support and trolley support will be strong and able to handle larger loads since they are fixedly connected and the tubular support can move with respect to the rod thus allowing the device to be placed into many different configurations depending on the process that is to be performed on the carcass thus making the device more flexible.

Referring to claim 14, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. and Hazenbroek et al. do not disclose the bird carrier is fixed to a bottom end of the rod. Altenpohl does disclose the

bird carrier – 12 is fixed to a bottom end of the rod – 14 and 28 – see figures 1-3.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al. and Altenpohl and further add the bird carrier fixed to the bottom end of the rod of Altenpohl, so as to make the device stronger in that the bird carrier holds the carcass which can be heavy and with the bird carrier fixed to the rod the connection between the rod and bird carrier is strong and thus can handle heavy poultry carcasses.

Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. in view of Altenpohl as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Sullivan.

Referring to claim 15, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and Altenpohl do not disclose one of the aligned openings is a slotted opening. Sullivan does disclose one of the aligned openings – 23 is a slotted opening – see for example figure 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al., and Altenpohl and add the slotted aligned opening of Sullivan, so as to make device adjustable in that the wheel axle can move along the slotted opening so as to adjust its height thus making the device easier to operate.

Referring to claim 17, Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and Altenpohl do not disclose the slotted opening is formed in the tubular support. Sullivan does disclose the slotted opening – 23 is formed in the tubular support – 19 – see for example figures 1-3. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and

Altenpohl and add the slotted opening in the tubular support of Sullivan so as to make the device adjustable in that the wheel axle can move along the slotted opening so as to adjust its height thus making the device easier to operate.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. in view of Altenpohl in view of Sullivan as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,581,339 to Smith. Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., Altenpohl, and Sullivan do not disclose the slotted opening is formed in the rod. Smith does disclose the slotted opening – 50 and 51 is formed in the rod – 49 – see for example figure 9. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. Hazenbroek et al., Altenpohl, and Sullivan and add the slotted opening in the rod of Smith so as to make the device adjustable in that the wheel axle can move along the slotted opening so as to adjust its height thus making the device easier to operate.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. in view of Hazenbroek et al. in view of Altenpohl in view of Sullivan as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al. the turning means – 21 and 29 includes a pin – 21 for indicating an angular position of the turning means – 21 and 29 – see figures 1-8 and column 5 lines 13-54. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the shackle assembly of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., Hazenbroek et al., and Sullivan and further add the turning means with a pin to indicate the angular position of Van Den Nieuwelaar et al., so as to make the

device easy to operate since the position of the pin shows which position the turning means is in, therefore indicating to the user which position the device is to be in.

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,488,635 to Linville in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,896,399 to Hazenbroek.

Referring to claim 19, Linville discloses a method of processing poultry carcasses as the carcasses move along a poultry path – 12 and for weighing the carcasses on a weighing scale – 40 as the carcasses are moved along the processing path - 12, the method comprising suspending the carcasses from a shackle – 10 having a trolley support – 18 and 29 with a trolley – 12, 12a, and 20 attached thereto – see figures 1-4, and a bird carrier – 22 and 24 connected to the trolley support – 18 and 29 and while the carcass is suspended: passing the trolley – 12, 12a, and 20 over the weighing scale – 40 – see figure 1, in response to passing the trolley over the weighing scale- 40 , lifting the bird carrier – 22 and 24 with respect to the trolley support – 18 and 29 using the scale – 40 – see column 3 lines 18-53.

Linville does not disclose turning the carcasses about a vertical axis and cutting the carcass into segments. Hazenbroek does disclose turning the carcasses about a vertical axis – see column 4 lines 8-21. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to take the method of processing poultry carcasses of Linville and add turning the carcasses about a vertical axis of Hazenbroek, so as to make the processing easier in that the carcasses can be positioned in various positions depending on what process is to be performed, thus making the process quicker and more efficient. Hazenbroek further discloses cutting the carcass into segments – see column 5 lines 41-60. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the

method of processing poultry carcasses of Linville and add the cutting of the carcass into segments of Hazenbroek, so as to make the process quicker and more efficient in that the weighing and cutting of the carcass is done in close proximity thus making the device of the method more compact and allowing more processes to be carried out on the poultry carcass.

Referring to claim 20, Linville does not disclose the step of turning the carcasses about a vertical axis comprises moving the trolley along the processing path and engaging a cam follower mounted on the trolley support with a cam positioned along the processing path. Hazenbroek does disclose the step of turning the carcasses about a vertical axis comprises moving the trolley – 23 along the processing path – 27 and engaging a cam follower – 50 mounted on the trolley support – 35 with a cam – 54 positioned along the processing path – 27 – see figures 1-3 and column 4 lines 8-21. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method of processing poultry carcasses and add the turning step including a cam follower engaging a cam of Hazenbroek, so as to make the turning step automated and thus make the process quicker since the turning step is not done manually.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linville in view of Hazenbroek as applied to claims 19 and 20 above, and further in view of Hazenbroek et al.

Referring to both claims 21 and 22, Linville and Hazenbroek do not disclose the step of lifting the bird carrier with respect to the trolley support comprises telescoping the bird carrier with respect to the trolley support. Hazenbroek et al. does disclose the step of lifting the bird carrier – 12 with respect to the trolley support – 20 comprises telescoping

the bird carrier – 12 with respect to the trolley support – 20 – see figures 1-5 and column 3 lines 45-67, column 4 lines 1-67 and column 5 lines 1-25. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to take the method of processing poultry carcasses of Linville and Hazenbroek and add the lifting step comprising telescoping the bird carrier with respect to the trolley support of Hazenbroek et al., so as to make the device of the method adjustable in that since it is telescoping it can handle different sized carcasses of different weights with no accuracy problems during processing.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to poultry shackles in general:

U.S. Pat. No. 2,739,347 to Sharp et al. – shows telescoping shackle

U.S. Pat. No. 3,717,240 to Ekstam – shows shackle with turning means

U.S. Pat. No. 5,505,657 to Janssen et al. – shows turning means

U.S. Pat. No. 6,179,701 to Tieleman – shows shackle with turning means

U.S. Pat. No. 6,179,702 to Hazenbroek – shows cam driven turning means

EP Pat. No. 0086700 to Charlot et al. – shows telescoping shackle

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to David Parsley whose telephone number is (703) 306-0552. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon, can be reached at (703) 308-2574.


PETER M. POON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600